

Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 01174 01 OF 02 021638Z

42

ACTION EUR-25

INFO OCT-01 IO-14 ISO-00 CIAE-00 PM-07 INR-10 L-03 NEA-10

NSAE-00 PA-04 RSC-01 PRS-01 SPC-03 USIA-15 TRSE-00

SAM-01 SAJ-01 ACDA-19 CU-04 OMB-01 OIC-04 AEC-11

AECE-00 DRC-01 H-03 NSC-10 SS-20 /169 W

----- 097374

P R 021330Z MAR 74

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 4395

SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

INFO ALL NATO CAPITALS 3760

AMEMBASSY VIENNA

USNMR SHAPE

USDOCOSOUTH

USLOSACLANT

USCINCEUR

USMISSION GENEVA

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 1 OF 2 USNATO 1174

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: NATO, PARM

SUBJECT: CSCE CONFIDENCE BUILDING MEASURES

GENEVA FOR USDEL CSCE

VIENNA FOR USDEL MBFR

REF: A) STATE 41005; B) USNATO 1055; C) GENEVA 270; D) GENEVA 1129;

E) VIENNA 1760; F) STATE 37815; G) BONN 3180 NOTAL

SUMMARY: POLADS ON MARCH 1 DISCUSSED WAYS TO BRIDGE GAPS BETWEEN WESTERN, NEUTRAL AND SOVIET POSITIONS ON CBM'S. ALTHOUGH SEVERAL ALLIES FOUND MERIT IN ELEMENTS OF NEW NEUTRAL DRAFT RESOLUTION, MAJORITY CONTINUED TO FAOR UK DRAFT IN VIRTUALLY ALL RESPECTS. CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 NATO 01174 01 OF 02 021638Z

GENERAL VIEW WAS THAT ALLIES SHOULD NOT MAKE CBM CONCESSIONS UNTIL VIENNA NEGOTIATORS HAD OPPORTUNITY TO SPELL OUT ALLIED PROPOSALS FOR MBFR STABILIZING MEASURES. HOWEVER, THERE WAS CONSENSUS THAT ALLIES MIGHT EVENTUALLY AT AN APPROPRIATE TIME

MAKE CONCESSIONS ON ADVANCE NOTIFICATION CBM, INCLUDING: DROPPING TO 30-DAY LIMIT FOR PRIOR ANNOUNCEMENT; SETTING HIGHER NUMERICAL THRESHOLD FOR MANEUVERS; AND POSSIBLY ALSO LIMITING APPLICATION OF CBM TO SOVIET BORDER TERRITORY AS WELL AS ELIMINATING SOME OF DETAILED

INFORMATION BE GIVEN IN NOTIFICATIONS. ALLIES HAVE ASKED FOR U.S. SUGGESTIONS FOR DISPOSING OF MOVEMENTS ISSUE IN FINAL CSCE DOCUMENT. ACTION REQUESTED: GUIDANCE ON MOVEMENTS QUESTION, AND ON QUESTION OF OPENNESS IN DEFENSE EXPENDITURES AS PROJECTED REF A. POLADS WILL AGAIN DISCUSS CBM'S ON MARCH 5, AT WHICH TIME WE WILL DRAW ON STATE 41274 NOTAL JUST RECEIVED. END SUMMARY.

1. OPENING SPECIAL POLADS MEETING ON CBM'S ON MARCH 1, CHAIRMAN PROPOSED FOCUS ON AGENDA SUGGESTED BY UK. (REF B, PARA 5).

2. IN GENERAL STATEMENT UK REP REVIEWED TACTICAL SITUATION IN GENEVA, CONCLUDING THAT RECENT NEUTRAL DRAFT DESPITE DEFICIENCIES WAS TACTICAL ASSET TO ALLIES SINCE IN MANY RESPECTS IT TOOK TOUGHER POSITIONS THAN UK DRAFT RESOLUTION, AND THUS ENHANCED VALUE OF UK DRAFT AS A REASONABLE COMPROMISE. HE EXPRESSED HOPE THAT ALLIES WOULD SUPPORT USING UK DRAFT AS BASIS FOR DRAFTING IN MILITARY SECURITY SUBCOMMITTEE. AT SAME TIME, UK BELIEVED ALLIES SHOULD BEGIN THINKING OF HYPOTHEITICAL WAYS TO FALL BACK FROM PRESENT WESTERN POSITIONS, AND PROPOSED THAT POLADS FOCUS ON CONCESSIONS THAT MIGHT BE ACCEPTABLE IN THE FUTURE. HE STRESSED CONFIDENTIALITY OF DISCUSSION, AND SUGGESTED THAT THERE BE NO WRITTEN RECORD OF FALLBACKS DISCUSSED BEYOND WHAT POLADS REPORTED IN THEIR OWN NATIONAL CHANNELS. CHAIRMAN LATER CONFIRMED THIS PROCEDURE.

3. WITH RESPECT TO REQUEST THAT UK DRAFT SERVE AS BASIS FOR FINAL DOCUMENT, TOHER REPS POINTED OUT THAT DRAFTING PROCEDURE AGREED EARLIER THIS WEEK IN GENEVA PROVIDED FOR A "CATALOGUE ANALYTIQUE" OF PROPOSALS BY TOPIC, WITH RESULT THAT ELEMENTS OF VARIOUS DRAFTS WOULD BE BROKEN UP INTO CHAPTERS, AND NO SINGLE DRAFT WOULD HAVE PRIORITY.

4. POLADS ACCEPTED UK IDEA OF DISCUSSING POSSIBLE FALLBACKS, BUT WITH CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 NATO 01174 01 OF 02 021638Z

EXCEPTION OF FRENCH REP ALSO AGREED GENERALLY WITH CANADIAN COMMENT THAT CBM CONCESSIONS SHOULD BE WITHHELD UNTIL ALLIES IN VIENNA HAD HAD FULL OPPORTUNITY TO SPELL OUT AND EXPLAIN PROPOSALS FOR MBFR STABILIZING MEASURES. IN PARTICULAR, CANADIAN REP SAID INDICATION NOW OF ALLIED WILLINGNESS TO RAISE THRESHOLD FOR ADVANCE NOTIFICATION CBM WOULD UNDERMINE AGREED ALLIED GOAL OF 10,000-MAN THRESHOLD FOR ADVANCE NOTIFICATION OF EXERCISES IN MBFR ZONE.

5. REPS OF FRANCE, NORWAY, NETHERLANDS, TURKEY, FRG AND BELGIUM GAVE FURTHER VIEW THAT ALLIES SHOULD NOT DISCOURAGE NEUTRALS FROM PRESSING THEIR PROPOSALS ON SOVIETS. NORWEGIAN AND TURKISH REPS SAID THEY PREFERRED CERTAIN FORMULATIONS IN NEUTRAL DRAFT TO BRITISH

POINTS, BUT NEUTRALS EFFORT HAD SPARED THEM THE DIFFICULTY OF BREAKING ALLIED RANKS AND INTRODUCING AMENDMENTS THEMSELVES.

6. SUBSEQUENT DISCUSSION FOCUSSED ON SPECIFIC ISSUES IN UK AND NEUTRAL DRAFT RESOLUTIONS, AS FOLLOWS:

A. MILITARY MOVEMENTS - IN REPLY TO QUESTION OF UK REP, U.S. REP SAID WE ARE AWARE THAT HELSINKI DOCUMENT REQUIRES SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT ON ITS STUDY OF MOVEMENTS, AND THAT MERELY POSTPONING THE MOVEMENTS ISSUE UNTIL AFTER CSCE MIGHT HAVE IMPLICATIONS FOR FOLLOW-ON MACHINERY. OTHERS, HOWEVER, CONTINUED TO ASK FOR U.S. VIEWS ON HANDLING PROBLEM OF STUDY AND REPORT, AND DISPOSING OF MOVEMENTS ISSUE INFIMAL CSCE DOCUMENT. UK REP SAID NORWEGIAN COMPROMISE IN REF C WOULD BE ACCEPTABLE TO HIS GOVERNMENT, IF REFERENCE TO INDEPENDENT AIR AND NAVAL MOVEMENTS AND MOVEMENTS BELOW DIVISION THRESHOLD WERE REMOVED. OTHER POLADS NODDED GENERAL AGREEMENT WITH UK.

B. TIME LIMITATIONS - POLADS AND MC REP UNANIMOUSLY AGREED WITH U.S. VIEW THAT 30-DAY ADVANCE NOTIFICATION TIME FRAME WOULD BE AN ACCEPTABLE OUTCOME, BUT THAT ALLIES SHOULD NOT YET RETREAT FROM 60 DAYS, WHICH COULD SERVE AS AN EVENTUAL BARGAINING CHIP.

C. AREA OF APPLICATION - UK REP SAID THAT PENDING MC REPORT ON QUESTION, UK COULD TENTATIVELY ACCEPT LIMITATION OF AREA COVERED BY ADVANCDE NOTIFICATION BOLIGATION TO 500-KM BAND OF SOVIET TERRITORY, AS A FALLBACK POSITION. HOWEVER, UK BELIEVES ALLIES SHOULD CONTINUE TO PRESS FOR GENERAL FORMULATION "IN EUROPE" U.S. AND ITALIAN CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 04 NATO 01174 01 OF 02 021638Z

N

REPS SUPPORTED UK ON THIS POINT. UK REP ALSO REPORTED THAT SOVIETS APPEAR TO BE SAYING DIFFERENT THINGS TO DIFFERENT ALLIES ABOUT HOW MUCH OF THIER TERRITORY COULD BE INCLUDED. THEY HAD RECENTLY SUGGESTED TO UK AND FRG REPS THAT BAND WOULD HAVE TO BE NARROWER ON NORTHERN AND SOUTHERN FLANKS, PERHAPS ONLY 100 KM. NETHERLANDS REP CONFIRMED THIS REPORT, AS DID NORWEGIAN, WHO STATED THAT SUCH A LIMITATION WOULD BE UNACCEPTABLE TO HIS GOVERNMENT. TURKISH REP REITERATED ANKARA'S VIEW THAT PARTS OF TURKEY WOULD ALSO HAVE TO BE EXCLUDED FROM "EUROPE", TAKING INTO ACCOUNT THAT TURKEY HAS NON-EUROPEAN NEIGHBORS. NOE OF POLADS FOUND ANY MERIT IN COMPLICATED FORMULATION IN NEUTRAL DRAFT FOR AREA, AND UK SPECIFICALLY CRITICIZED VAGUE REFERENCES TO "ADJACENT" INTERNATIONAL WATERS AND AIR SPACE, AND CONCEPT OF 200-MILE TERRITORIAL WATERS. U.S. REP ADDED THAT WHILE NEUTRAL STATEMENT (REF D) EXPRESSED INTENT TO INCLUDE NORTH SEA AND BALTIC IN ADVANCE NOTIFICATION, NEUTRALS HAD SPECIFIED ONLY THE MEDITERRANENA IN THEIR DRAFT RESOLUTION. TURKISH REP ALSO NOTED SIGNIFICANT OMISSION OF BLACK SEA EVEN IN ORAL STATEMENTS OF NEUTRALS.

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 NATO 01174 02 OF 02 021642Z

42

ACTION EUR-25

INFO OCT-01 IO-14 ISO-00 CIAE-00 PM-07 INR-10 L-03 NEA-10

NSAE-00 PA-04 RSC-01 PRS-01 SPC-03 USIA-15 TRSE-00

SAM-01 SAJ-01 H-03 NSC-10 SS-20 ACDA-19 CU-04 OMB-01

OIC-04 AEC-11 AECE-00 DRC-01 /169 W

----- 097392

P R 021330Z MAR 74

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 4396

SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

INFO ALL NATO CAPITALS 3761

AMEMBASSY VIENNA

USNMR SHAPE

USDOCOSOUTH

USLOSACLANT

USCINCEUR

USMISSION GENEVA

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 2 OF 2 USNATO 1174

D. DEFINITION OF "MAJOR MANEUVER" - CANADIAN, U.S. AND UK REPS AGREED THAT ANY DEFINITION WOULD BE HAZARDOUS, BECAUSE OF MBFR IMPLICATIONS. U.S. REP READ DEFINITION OF MAJOR EXERCISE IN CANADIAN STATEMENT FOR FEB 28 MBFR PLENARY (REF E) WHICH INCLUDES NOT ONLY NUMERICAL FACTOR, BUT ALSO AREA AND TIME FRAME. CHAIRMAN LATER REPEATED THESE POINTS IN SUMMING UPP, AND THERE WERE NO OBJECTIONS.

E. NUMERICAL THRESHOLD - UK AUTHORITIES BELIEVED NEUTRAL PROPOSAL OF 18,000 AND U.S. SUGGESTION OF 20,000 WERE TOO HIGH, SOME COUNTRIES COULD HAVE MANEUVERS EVEN WITH TWO DIVISIONS WITHOUT OBLIGATION TO NOTIFY THEM. HOWEVER, THE UK WOULD BE PREPARED TO GO TO A THRESHOLD OF 15,000 MEN IMPOSSIBLE FUTURE COMPROMISE. IF ALLIES IN GENEVA WERE TO MAKE THIS CONCESSION, HOWEVER, THERE WOULD HAVE TO BE CLEAR DISSOCIATION FROM MBFR THRESHOLD OF 10,000. BELGIAN, ITALIAN AND NORWEGIAN REPS BELIEVED THAT UK PROPOSAL OF THRESHOLD OF 15,000 MIGHT EVENTUALLY BE ACCEPTABLE TO THEIR GOVERNMENTS. CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 NATO 01174 02 OF 02 021642Z

F. NATURE OF OBLIGATION - INVIEW OF U.S. CONCERN, UK REP STATED HMG WILLING TO CONSIDER ALTERNATIVES FOR OPENING PHRASES IN OPERATIVE PARAGRAPHS ON ADVANCE NOTIFICATION OF MANEUVERS AND OBSERVERS, SUCH AS "EXPRESS THEIR FIRM INTENTION TO ..." U.S. REP OBSERVED THAT THIS WAS NOT MUCH DIFFERENT FROM U.S. PREFERENCE (REF F) FOR "DECLARE THEIR INTENTION TO...", AND BASIS SEEMED TO

EXIST FOR INTRA-ALLIANCE AGREEMENT. SEVERAL OTHER REPS STILL
FAVORED STRONGER COMMITMENT, BUT GENERALLY AGREED THAT THERE SHOULD
BE NO LEGAL OBLIGATION.

G. OTHER ASPECTS - IN ADDITIONAL OBSERVATIONS, UK REP SAID UK
WOULD BE PREPARED AS FALLBACK, IF SOVIETS INSIST, TO DROP SECOND
SENTENCE IN OPERATIVE PARAGRAPH 1 D, WHICH GIVES ADDITIONAL DETAILS
FOR ADVANCE NOTIFICATION OF MANEUVERS. RE PARA III (A) OF ITS
DRAFT, UK CONTINUED TO HOPE U.S. WOULD FIND IT POSSIBLE TO ACCEPT
BLAND FORMULATION ON OPENNESS ON DEFENSE EXPENDITURES. ON POSSIBLE
ACCOMMODATIONS WITH NEUTRALS, UK WOULD BE PREPARED TO ACCEPT
ADDITIONAL DETAIL IN DESCRIPTION OF ROLE OF OBSERVERS; TO INSERT
CONCEPT OF MILITARY SELF-RESTRAINT IN PREAMBLE; AND TO MAKE SOME
REFERENCE TO AMPHIBIOUS FORCES IN CONNECTION WITH ADVANCE NOTIFICA-
TION, BUT NOT TO DROP THE NUMERICAL THRESHOLD FOR MANEUVERS WITH
AMPHIBIOUS ELEMENTS. UK FOUND NEUTRAL LANGUAGE ON MILITARY
EXCHANGES UNACCEPTABLY DETAILED.
RUMSFELD

CONFIDENTIAL

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 11 JUN 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 02 MAR 1974
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: golinofr
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1974ATO01174
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: 11652 GDS
Errors: n/a
Film Number: n/a
From: NATO
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1974/newtext/t19740381/abbrytok.tel
Line Count: 236
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: n/a
Original Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 5
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: A) STATE 41005; B) USNATO 1055; C) GENEVA 270; D) GENEVA 1129;
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: golinofr
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 25 MAR 2002
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <25 MAR 2002 by kelleyw0>; APPROVED <02 MAY 2002 by golinofr>
Review Markings:

Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
30 JUN 2005

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: CSCE CONFIDENCE BUILDING MEASURES
TAGS: NATO, PARM
To: STATE
SECDEF INFO ALL NATO CAPITALS
VIENNA
USNMR SHAPE
USDOCOSOUTH
USLOSACLANT
USCINCEUR

GENEVA

Type: TE

Markings: Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005